

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/918,634	08/01/2001	Yoon-Hyoung Cho	247/033	3246	
75	90 08/11/2004		EXAMINER		
Lee & STERB	BA, P.C.		PATEL,	ASHOK	
Suite 2000 1101 Wilson Bo	nilevard		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Arlington, VA			2879		
			DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	cK
Advisory Action	09/918,634	CHO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashok Patel	2879	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	ntion. A proper repl or places the applica	ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting the FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approperties the final th	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	•	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	,		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	s.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject and 3.	ion(s): obviousness type double	patenting rejection	of cliams 1
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consideration Sheet.	dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	(s) a) will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided below		and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by th	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:		1	
		Ashok Patel	
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2879	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments relating to prior art rejection of claims 1 and 3 are not found persuassive..